



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,703	10/23/2001	Terence Sean Sullivan		2954

7590 12/28/2004
Terence Sean Sullivan
PO Box 425475
Cambridge, MA 02142

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHUOC H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/001,703	Applicant(s) SULLIVAN ET AL	
	Examiner Phuoc H. Nguyen	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-9,13-16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Horstmann et al. (Hereafter, Horstmann) U.S. Patent 6,779,022.

3. Regarding claim 1, Horstmann discloses in figure 1 a method for the optimization of a messaging system comprising a sending node (eg. communication server 105) and at least one receiving node (eg. laptop computer 125 or wireless device 140), within a data network with a limited resource, comprising the steps of: assigning messages a prioritization value at said sending node (eg. server 105 receive the an email message and based on the user profile setting (eg. priority level filter) assign a priority to the message (Figures 2 and 6; and col. 4 lines 66 through col. 5 lines 5; and col. 8 lines 36-40); identifying selected messages with a highest said prioritization value at said sending node, and delivering said selected messages to an appropriate said receiving node, until said limited resource is exhausted (col. 4 2nd paragraph; and col. 6 lines 46-59).

4. Regarding claim 2, Horstmann further discloses the step of storing said selected messages at said receiving node prior to a user request to collect selected messages from said messaging

Art Unit: 2143

system, thereby proactively buffering selected messages at said receiving node (col. 9 lines 7-20).

5. Regarding claim 3, Horstmann further discloses the step of decomposing messages into message elements at said sending node, and then processing each said message element as an independent message (col. 8 lines 20-36).

6. Regarding claim 4, Horstmann further discloses decomposition divides messages into said message elements comprising a header comprising at least a sender messaging address identifier and a message subject, a first message section, comprising no more than a predetermined amount of data, and a second message section (col. 8 lines 55-65).

7. Regarding claim 5, Horstmann further discloses prioritization value depends upon the type of said message element (col. 8 lines 25-40).

8. Regarding claim 6, Horstmann further discloses the full text of said message is provided to a set of messaging nodes that is a smaller subset of the messaging nodes provided with a header of said message (col. 8 last paragraph through col. 9 2nd paragraph).

9. Regarding claim 7, Horstmann further discloses limited resource comprises communications time between said sending node and said receiving node (col. 10 lines 6-15).

10. Regarding claim 8, Horstmann further discloses limited resource comprises collective communications bandwidth from said sending node (Figure 5).

11. Regarding claim 9, Horstmann further discloses limited resource comprises storage capacity on said receiving node (col. 8 lines 55-61).

Art Unit: 2143

12. Regarding claim 13, Horstmann further discloses prioritization value depends upon an association table value for relating said receiving node and a message recipient, and prioritization value is greater for administrative messages (col. 7 lines 64-67).
13. Regarding claim 14, Horstmann further discloses prioritization value depends upon the payment of a surcharge for the express delivery of said message (col. 8 lines 55-65).
14. Regarding claim 15, Horstmann further discloses prioritization value is greater for administrative messages (col. 7 lines 64-67).
15. Regarding claim 16, Horstmann further discloses prioritization value depends upon the geographic location of said receiving node (Figure 4).
16. Regarding claim 19, Horstmann further discloses sending node comprises a central server in a messaging system (Figure 1, communication server).
17. Regarding claim 20, Horstmann further discloses receiving node comprises a portable messaging unit including user interface means and storage means, operated by a message recipient (Figure 1, wireless device).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horstmann in view of Ueno et al (Hereafter, Ueno) U.S. Patent 6,226,670.

Horstmann disclose identifying selected messages with a highest said prioritization value at said sending node; however, Horstmann fails to teach the prioritization value depends upon the age, service level of the sender, of said message.

Ueno discloses the prioritization value depends upon the age, service level of the sender, and service level of the recipient of said message (Figures 11-13; and col. 2 lines 59-65).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Ueno's teaching into Horstmann's method to set the priority level based upon the age, the service level of the sender, and the service level of the recipient in order to categorize messages and level of emergency degree so the recipient act on based upon the level of priority.

20. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horstmann in view of Horvitz et al (Hereafter, Horvitz) U.S. Patent 6,161,130.

Horstmann disclose identifying selected messages with a highest said prioritization value at said sending node; however, Horstmann fails to teach the prioritization value depends upon the predicted probability based upon prior behavior that said recipient will request the collection of incoming messages at said receiving node, and the message provided to said receiving node when said prioritization value exceeds a predetermined threshold.

Horvitz teaches prioritization value depends upon the predicted probability based upon prior behavior that said recipient will request the collection of incoming messages at said receiving node, and the message provided to said receiving node when said prioritization value exceeds a predetermined threshold (col. 4 lines 40-53; and col. 13 lines 57 though col. 14, lines 42).

Art Unit: 2143

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Horvitz's teaching into Horstmann's method to predicted probability based upon prior behavior, and provided message to receiving node when the threshold is exceeded, as a result it provides an accurately and automatically detect and classify the incoming email messages.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Haneda et al. U.S. Patent 6,189,027

Hirosawa et al. U.S. Patent 6,418,465

Eggleston et al. U.S. Patent 6,101,531

Wang et al. U.S. Patent 6,442,593

Raghunandan U.S. Patent 6,816,885

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3919. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon -Thu (7AM-4: 30PM) and off every other Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phuoc H. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

December 17, 2004



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100